

### REMARKS

Claims 23-44 are pending in the application. Claims 29-39 and 44 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 23-28 and 40-43 are rejected. Claims 23-44 are amended.

#### *Claim Objections*

Claim 23 is objected to because the claim recites in the preamble “a method for managing a denitration catalyst” and also “the method for managing a plurality of denitration catalysts”. The Examiner believes that the first expression is a typo, since it contradicts the second expression and does not correspond to the body of the claim. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 23 and claims 24-44 that contain the same language or require consistency.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

**Claims 23-38 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention because “the amended claims recite ‘measuring a performance of the denitration catalysts ... in consideration of a ratio of inlet  $\text{NH}_3$  to inlet  $\text{NO}_x$ ’. The Applicants refer in support of the amendment to page 18, lines 14-17 of the specification:

‘A denitration ratio calculating method is not specifically limited as long as the method is to calculate the denitration ratio in consideration of (inlet mole ratio) = (inlet  $\text{HN}_3$ /inlet  $\text{NO}_x$ ) of each of the denitration catalysts 101A to 101D.’

This expression is obviously a poor translation of original Japanese application and is not clear and definite. It is absolutely clear for a routineer in the art that there is no way to measure a performance of the denitration catalysts by consideration of a molar ratio of inlet  $\text{NH}_3$  to inlet  $\text{NO}_x$ , since these gases do not pass through the catalysts. The proper explanation of application of ratios involving inlet  $\text{HN}_3$  and inlet  $\text{NO}_x$  is provided on page 19.

Therefore, the Applicants did not reasonably convey to those skilled in the art that they possessed the invention recited in the claims, since the disclosure does not provide an adequate description of the method recited in the claims.”

Applicants’ Reply

As can be seen from equations (1) and (2) at page 19, the denitration ratio is calculated with a ratio of inlet  $\text{NH}_3$  to inlet  $\text{NO}_x$  (defined as “inlet mole ratio). The reason why the inlet mole ratio is used is explained on page 18, lines 18-23 of the specification which states:

The reason for considering the inlet mole ratio is as follows. Since  $\text{NH}_3$  is injected just before injection of the denitration catalyst in proportion to an amount of gas and absorption of  $\text{NH}_3$  to the catalyst is a rate-determining reaction of a denitration reaction itself, it is necessary to grasp and consider the  $\text{NH}_3$  concentration of each of the denitration catalysts 101A to 101D at the inlet and the outlet therefor.

Therefore, the applicant believes that claims comply with the written description requirement.

**Claims 23-38 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner states that “The amended claims recite ‘measuring a performance of the denitration catalysts ... in consideration of a ratio of inlet  $\text{NH}_3$  to inlet  $\text{NO}_x$ ’. There is no way for a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform a step of measuring a performance of the denitration catalysts ‘in consideration of a ratio of inlet  $\text{NH}_3$  to inlet  $\text{NO}_x$ ’, because these gases do not pass through the catalysts.”

Applicants’ reply to the written description rejection applies here as well and demonstrates that the disclosure and claims are enabling.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

Date: August 19, 2009